

Ware, Rochelle

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 12:19 PM
To: Kaplan, Jennifer; Hanger, Eric; (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

(b) (5)

(b) (6)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Inspector General
Office of Investigations
Atlanta Field Office

(b) (6)

To report fraud, waste or abuse impacting EPA, please contact the EPA OIG Hotline via telephone numbers 202-566-2475 or 888-545-2599, or email at oig_hotline@epa.gov
To report threats directed against EPA employees, contractors, facilities and assets, please email report.EPA.threats@epa.gov

From: Kaplan, Jennifer
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 12:16 PM
To: Hanger, Eric <Hanger.Eric@epa.gov>; (b) (6) (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

(b) (5) (b) (6)

From: Hanger, Eric
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 12:15 PM
To: (b) (6); Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

(b) (5), (b) (6)

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 12:05 PM
To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; (b) (6) Hanger, Eric

<Hanger.Eric@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

(b) (5)

(b) (6)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Inspector General
Office of Investigations
Atlanta Field Office

(b) (6)

To report fraud, waste or abuse impacting EPA, please contact the EPA OIG Hotline via telephone numbers 202-566-2475 or 888-545-2599, or email at oig_hotline@epa.gov

To report threats directed against EPA employees, contractors, facilities and assets, please email report.EPA.threats@epa.gov

From: Kaplan, Jennifer

Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 12:02 PM

To: (b) (6) Hanger, Eric

<Hanger.Eric@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Thank you all for speaking with me (separate conversations) this morning. If acceptable to both OI and OC, I am proposing the following response. Please let me know if any edits should be made or if you have concerns. (b) (5)

(b) (6)

(b) (6), (b) (5)

Jennifer Kaplan

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 5:28 PM

To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>

Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Jennifer,

Thank you for the email. (b) (6) had written a letter (attached) that explains (b) (6) concerns.

Thank you again for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Paul

From: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 2:35 PM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry (b) (6)

Hello, Paul,

I'm happy to fill in while Jeff is on leave. If you are able to tell me the specific nature of (b) (6) concerns, I'll do my best to look into them.

Thank you.

Jennifer

Jennifer Kaplan
Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Congressional and Public Affairs
Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202 (b) (6) mobile

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 10:11 AM
To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning Jennifer and Kentai,

(b) (6).

I wanted to follow-up on the inquiry for (b) (6).

(b) (6) had expressed some concerns about the investigation tactics being used for (b) (6) by the OIG. Is there a way to have someone who heads OIG to review (b) (6) concerns?

Thank you,

Paul Oh
Field Representative
Congressman Rob Woodall GA-7
Phone: 770-232-1131
Fax: 770-232-2909

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 9:00 AM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good morning. Still no updates that I can provide at this time!

Will reach out to you when I can.

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Sent: Monday, June 10, 2019 2:19 PM

To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

I would like to check and see if there are any new updates on the inquiry for (b) (6).

Thank you,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 8:31 AM

To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning, Paul.

There are no updates at the moment. As promised, I will provide you information when I can.

Take care,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Sent: Friday, April 19, 2019 10:36 AM

To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning Jeff,

Following up again to see if there are any updates on the inquiry for (b) (6)

Thank you,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 3:00 PM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good afternoon. I unfortunately cannot provide any updates at this juncture. I will provide information once I am able to do so.

Always,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 2:50 PM
To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

Could you please provide me with any new updates on the inquiry for (b) (6) ?

Sincerely,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, January 28, 2019 8:08 AM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

I apologize for the delayed response, but we are just returning today after the lengthy shutdown.

At this point, all I can say is that this matter is under review. We will contact your office when appropriate.

Take care,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Thursday, January 3, 2019 3:25 PM
To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

Could you please provide me with an update on this case?

Sincerely,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2018 6:07 PM

To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good evening. My name is Jeff Lagda, and I am a public affairs specialist at the EPA's Office of Inspector General. EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs forwarded the complaint of your constituent (b) (6), to the OIG.

I am confirming receipt of the complaint.

The leadership will review the matter, and the OIG will contact your office when appropriate.

Thanks,

Jeff

Jeffrey A. Lagda
Congressional and Media Liaison
Office of Congressional and Public Affairs - Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental and Protection Agency
1301 Constitution Ave. NW, Rm 3102
Washington, DC 20460
202-566-2584
Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2018 4:54 PM

To: OCIRmail <OCIRmail@epa.gov>

Subject: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Dear EPA Congressional,

(b) (6) a constituent of Congressman Rob Woodall, contacted our office concerning the pending investigation with the Office of Inspector General. Please see the attached documents, including a privacy waiver and detailed description of the issue.

I appreciate you looking into this matter and any assistance you can provide.

Sincerely,

Paul Oh
Field Representative
Congressman Rob Woodall GA-7
Phone: 770-232-1131
Fax: 770-232-2909

Ware, Rochelle

From: Kaplan, Jennifer
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2019 5:09 PM
To: (b) (6); Collins, Kevin W.; (b) (6); Hanger, Eric
Cc: Elbaum, Kentia; Lagda, Jeffrey; (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Thank you, (b) (6). That's just fine. I expect to be in the office next week but am fairly booked up Monday. Is there a time Tuesday morning that works for you?

Jennifer

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Friday, July 12, 2019 4:39 PM
To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Collins, Kevin W. <Collins.Kevin@epa.gov>; (b) (6);
(b) (6) Hanger, Eric <Hanger.Eric@epa.gov>
Cc: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; (b) (6)
(b) (6)
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Thank you. I apologize for not getting back to sooner. Quick question, (b) (5)

Thanks again.

From: Kaplan, Jennifer
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2019 8:29 AM
To: Collins, Kevin W. <Collins.Kevin@epa.gov>; (b) (6);
(b) (6) Hanger, Eric <Hanger.Eric@epa.gov>
Cc: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Subject: FW: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning, Kevin, (b) (6) and Eric,

A staffer for Congressman Woodall (Georgia) periodically contacts OCPA on behalf of a constituent, (b) (6) requesting updates on an alleged OIG investigation of (b) (6). The first communication we received on this matter was in November 2018; while I think that all of you have it, I don't want to forward it again because the main document contains (b) (6) social security number, and I don't see a tool to redact it. In the attached communication received late yesterday, (b) (6) is alleging that Special Agent (b) (6) is using inappropriate tactics. Some of these also were mentioned in (b) (6) original letter to (b) (6) congressman last November. The staffer, Paul Oh, is asking the OIG to review these concerns. Please advise.

Thank you.

Jennifer
202 (b) (6) mobile

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 5:28 PM
To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Jennifer,

Thank you for the email. (b) (6) had written a letter (attached) that explains (b) (6) concerns.

Thank you again for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Paul

From: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 2:35 PM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hello, Paul,

I'm happy to fill in while Jeff is on leave. If you are able to tell me the specific nature of (b) (6) concerns, I'll do my best to look into them.

Thank you.

Jennifer

Jennifer Kaplan
Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Congressional and Public Affairs
Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-(b) (6) mobile

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 10:11 AM
To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning Jennifer and Kentai,

(b) (6) very.

I wanted to follow-up on the inquiry for (b) (6).

(b) (6) had expressed some concerns about the investigation tactics being used for (b) (6) case by the OIG. Is there a way to have someone who heads OIG to review (b) (6) concerns?

Thank you,

Paul Oh
Field Representative
Congressman Rob Woodall GA-7
Phone: 770-232-1131
Fax: 770-232-2909

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 9:00 AM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good morning. Still no updates that I can provide at this time!

Will reach out to you when I can.

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2019 2:19 PM
To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

I would like to check and see if there are any new updates on the inquiry for (b) (6).

Thank you,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 8:31 AM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning, Paul.

There are no updates at the moment. As promised, I will provide you information when I can.

Take care,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Friday, April 19, 2019 10:36 AM
To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning Jeff,

Following up again to see if there are any updates on the inquiry for (b) (6).

Thank you,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 3:00 PM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good afternoon. I unfortunately cannot provide any updates at this juncture. I will provide information once I am able to do so.

Always,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 2:50 PM
To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

Could you please provide me with any new updates on the inquiry for (b) (6)?

Sincerely,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, January 28, 2019 8:08 AM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

I apologize for the delayed response, but we are just returning today after the lengthy shutdown.

At this point, all I can say is that this matter is under review. We will contact your office when appropriate.

Take care,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Sent: Thursday, January 3, 2019 3:25 PM

To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

Could you please provide me with an update on this case?

Sincerely,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2018 6:07 PM

To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good evening. My name is Jeff Lagda, and I am a public affairs specialist at the EPA's Office of Inspector General. EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs forwarded the complaint of your constituent (b) (6) to the OIG.

I am confirming receipt of the complaint.

The leadership will review the matter, and the OIG will contact your office when appropriate.

Thanks,

Jeff

Jeffrey A. Lagda
Congressional and Media Liaison
Office of Congressional and Public Affairs - Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental and Protection Agency
1301 Constitution Ave. NW, Rm 3102
Washington, DC 20460
202-566-2584
Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2018 4:54 PM

To: OCIRmail <OCIRmail@epa.gov>

Subject: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Dear EPA Congressional,

(b) (6) a constituent of Congressman Rob Woodall, contacted our office concerning the pending investigation with the Office of Inspector General. Please see the attached documents, including a privacy waiver and detailed description of the issue.

I appreciate you looking into this matter and any assistance you can provide.

Sincerely,

Paul Oh

Field Representative

Congressman Rob Woodall GA-7

Phone: 770-232-1131

Fax: 770-232-2909

Ware, Rochelle

From: Kaplan, Jennifer
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 4:19 PM
To: Oh, Paul
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey; Elbaum, Kentia
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good afternoon, Paul,

Thank you again for sharing (b) (6) letter, which alleges misconduct by OIG investigators. I have followed up with our Office of Investigations and been assured that no misconduct has occurred.

Please let Tia, Jeff and me know if you have additional questions we may be able to answer.

Jennifer

Jennifer Kaplan
Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Congressional and Public Affairs
Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-566-0918

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Thursday, July 11, 2019 5:36 PM
To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Thank you!

From: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, July 11, 2019 5:29 PM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Thank you, Paul. I did act on this email yesterday morning and am waiting for a reply from within my organization. I'll be back to you as soon as I am able.

Jennifer

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 5:28 PM
To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Jennifer,

Thank you for the email. (b) (6) had written a letter (attached) that explains (b) (6) concerns.

Thank you again for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Paul

From: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 2:35 PM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hello, Paul,

I'm happy to fill in while Jeff is on leave. If you are able to tell me the specific nature of (b) (6) concerns, I'll do my best to look into them.

Thank you.

Jennifer

Jennifer Kaplan
Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Congressional and Public Affairs
Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202 (b) (6) mobile

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 10:11 AM
To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning Jennifer and Kentai,

(b) (6)

I wanted to follow-up on the inquiry for (b) (6).

(b) (6) had expressed some concerns about the investigation tactics being used for (b) (6) case by the OIG. Is there a way to have someone who heads OIG to review (b) (6) concerns?

Thank you,

Paul Oh
Field Representative
Congressman Rob Woodall GA-7
Phone: 770-232-1131
Fax: 770-232-2909

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 9:00 AM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good morning. Still no updates that I can provide at this time!

Will reach out to you when I can.

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2019 2:19 PM
To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

I would like to check and see if there are any new updates on the inquiry for (b) (6).

Thank you,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 8:31 AM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning, Paul.

There are no updates at the moment. As promised, I will provide you information when I can.

Take care,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Friday, April 19, 2019 10:36 AM
To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning Jeff,

Following up again to see if there are any updates on the inquiry for (b) (6).

Thank you,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 3:00 PM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good afternoon. I unfortunately cannot provide any updates at this juncture. I will provide information once I am able to do so.

Always,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 2:50 PM
To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

Could you please provide me with any new updates on the inquiry for (b) (6) ?

Sincerely,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, January 28, 2019 8:08 AM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

I apologize for the delayed response, but we are just returning today after the lengthy shutdown.

At this point, all I can say is that this matter is under review. We will contact your office when appropriate.

Take care,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Thursday, January 3, 2019 3:25 PM
To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

Could you please provide me with an update on this case?

Sincerely,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2018 6:07 PM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good evening. My name is Jeff Lagda, and I am a public affairs specialist at the EPA's Office of Inspector General. EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs forwarded the complaint of your constituent (b) (6), to the OIG.

I am confirming receipt of the complaint.

The leadership will review the matter, and the OIG will contact your office when appropriate.

Thanks,

Jeff

Jeffrey A. Lagda
Congressional and Media Liaison
Office of Congressional and Public Affairs - Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental and Protection Agency
1301 Constitution Ave. NW, Rm 3102
Washington, DC 20460
202-566-2584
Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2018 4:54 PM
To: OCIRmail <OCIRmail@epa.gov>
Subject: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Dear EPA Congressional,

(b) (6), a constituent of Congressman Rob Woodall, contacted our office concerning the pending investigation with the Office of Inspector General. Please see the attached documents, including a privacy waiver and detailed description of the issue.

I appreciate you looking into this matter and any assistance you can provide.

Sincerely,

Paul Oh
Field Representative
Congressman Rob Woodall GA-7
Phone: 770-232-1131
Fax: 770-232-2909

Ware, Rochelle

From: Kaplan, Jennifer
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 1:52 PM
To: (b) (6); Hanger, Eric; (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Great, thanks all. I will edit per Eric's suggestions and send.

Jennifer

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 1:47 PM
To: Hanger, Eric <Hanger.Eric@epa.gov>; (b) (6); Kaplan, Jennifer
<Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

I am fine with the suggestion(s).

From: Hanger, Eric
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 12:15 PM
To: (b) (6); Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

(b) (6), (b) (5)

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 12:05 PM
To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; (b) (6); Hanger, Eric
<Hanger.Eric@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

(b) (5)

(b) (6)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Inspector General
Office of Investigations
Atlanta Field Office

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

To report fraud, waste or abuse impacting EPA, please contact the EPA OIG Hotline via telephone numbers 202-566-2475 or 888-545-2599, or email at oig_hotline@epa.gov

To report threats directed against EPA employees, contractors, facilities and assets, please email report.EPA.threats@epa.gov

From: Kaplan, Jennifer

Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 12:02 PM

To: (b) (6) Hanger, Eric

<Hanger.Eric@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Thank you all for speaking with me (separate conversations) this morning. If acceptable to both OI and OC, I am proposing the following response. Please let me know if any edits should be made or if you have concerns. (b) (5)

(b) (6)

(b) (5), (b) (6)

Jennifer Kaplan

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 5:28 PM

To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>

Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Jennifer,

Thank you for the email. (b) (6) had written a letter (attached) that explains (b) (6) concerns.

Thank you again for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Paul

From: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 2:35 PM

To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hello, Paul,

I'm happy to fill in while Jeff is on leave. If you are able to tell me the specific nature of (b) (6) concerns, I'll do my best to look into them.

Thank you.

Jennifer

Jennifer Kaplan
Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Congressional and Public Affairs
Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202 (b) (6) mobile

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 10:11 AM
To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning Jennifer and Kentai,

(b) (6).

I wanted to follow-up on the inquiry for (b) (6).

(b) (6) had expressed some concerns about the investigation tactics being used for (b) (6) case by the OIG. Is there a way to have someone who heads OIG to review (b) (6) concerns?

Thank you,

Paul Oh
Field Representative
Congressman Rob Woodall GA-7
Phone: 770-232-1131
Fax: 770-232-2909

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 9:00 AM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good morning. Still no updates that I can provide at this time!

Will reach out to you when I can.

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2019 2:19 PM

To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

I would like to check and see if there are any new updates on the inquiry for (b) (6).

Thank you,

Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 8:31 AM

To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry (b) (6)

Good morning, Paul.

There are no updates at the moment. As promised, I will provide you information when I can.

Take care,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Sent: Friday, April 19, 2019 10:36 AM

To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning Jeff,

Following up again to see if there are any updates on the inquiry for (b) (6).

Thank you,

Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 3:00 PM

To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good afternoon. I unfortunately cannot provide any updates at this juncture. I will provide information once I am able to do so.

Always,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 2:50 PM
To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

Could you please provide me with any new updates on the inquiry for (b) (6)?

Sincerely,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, January 28, 2019 8:08 AM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

I apologize for the delayed response, but we are just returning today after the lengthy shutdown.

At this point, all I can say is that this matter is under review. We will contact your office when appropriate.

Take care,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Thursday, January 3, 2019 3:25 PM
To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

Could you please provide me with an update on this case?

Sincerely,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2018 6:07 PM

To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: Congressional Inquiry (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good evening. My name is Jeff Lagda, and I am a public affairs specialist at the EPA's Office of Inspector General. EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs forwarded the complaint of your constituent, (b) (6), to the OIG.

I am confirming receipt of the complaint.

The leadership will review the matter, and the OIG will contact your office when appropriate.

Thanks,

Jeff

Jeffrey A. Lagda
Congressional and Media Liaison
Office of Congressional and Public Affairs - Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental and Protection Agency
1301 Constitution Ave. NW, Rm 3102
Washington, DC 20460
202-566-2584
Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2018 4:54 PM

To: OCIRmail <OCIRmail@epa.gov>

Subject: Congressional Inquiry (b) (6)

Dear EPA Congressional,

(b) (6), a constituent of Congressman Rob Woodall, contacted our office concerning the pending investigation with the Office of Inspector General. Please see the attached documents, including a privacy waiver and detailed description of the issue.

I appreciate you looking into this matter and any assistance you can provide.

Sincerely,

Paul Oh
Field Representative
Congressman Rob Woodall GA-7
Phone: 770-232-1131
Fax: 770-232-2909

Ware, Rochelle

From: Kaplan, Jennifer
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2019 8:29 AM
To: Collins, Kevin W.; (b) (6); Hanger, Eric
Cc: Elbaum, Kentia; Lagda, Jeffrey
Subject: FW: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)
Attachments: (b) (6).pdf

Good morning, Kevin, (b) (6) and Eric,

A staffer for Congressman Woodall (Georgia) periodically contacts OCPA on behalf of a (b) (6) requesting updates on an alleged OIG investigation (b) (6). The first communication we received on this matter was in November 2018; while I think that all of you have it, I don't want to forward it again because the main document contains (b) (6) social security number, and I don't see a tool to redact it. In the attached communication received late yesterday, (b) (6) is alleging that Special Agent (b) (6) is using inappropriate tactics. Some of these also were mentioned in (b) (6) original letter to (b) (6) congressman last November. The staffer, Paul Oh, is asking the OIG to review these concerns. Please advise.

Thank you.

Jennifer
(b) (6) mobile

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 5:28 PM
To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Jennifer,

Thank you for the email. (b) (6) had written a letter (attached) that explains (b) (6) concerns.

Thank you again for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Paul

From: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 2:35 PM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hello, Paul,

I'm happy to fill in while Jeff is on leave. If you are able to tell me the specific nature (b) (6) concerns, I'll do my best to look into them.

Thank you.

Jennifer

Jennifer Kaplan
Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Congressional and Public Affairs
Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202 (b) (6) mobile

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 10:11 AM
To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning Jennifer and Kentai,

(b) (6)
I wanted to follow-up on the inquiry for (b) (6).
(b) (6) expressed some concerns about the investigation tactics being used for (b) (6) case by the OIG. Is there a way to have someone who heads OIG to review (b) (6) concerns?

Thank you,

Paul Oh
Field Representative
Congressman Rob Woodall GA-7
Phone: 770-232-1131
Fax: 770-232-2909

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 9:00 AM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good morning. Still no updates that I can provide at this time!

Will reach out to you when I can.

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2019 2:19 PM

To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

I would like to check and see if there are any new updates on the inquiry for (b) (6).

Thank you,

Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 8:31 AM

To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning, Paul.

There are no updates at the moment. As promised, I will provide you information when I can.

Take care,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Sent: Friday, April 19, 2019 10:36 AM

To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning Jeff,

Following up again to see if there are any updates on the inquiry for (b) (6)

Thank you,

Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 3:00 PM

To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good afternoon. I unfortunately cannot provide any updates at this juncture. I will provide information once I am able to do so.

Always,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 2:50 PM
To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

Could you please provide me with any new updates on the inquiry for (b) (6) ?

Sincerely,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, January 28, 2019 8:08 AM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

I apologize for the delayed response, but we are just returning today after the lengthy shutdown.

At this point, all I can say is that this matter is under review. We will contact your office when appropriate.

Take care,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Thursday, January 3, 2019 3:25 PM
To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

Could you please provide me with an update on this case?

Sincerely,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2018 6:07 PM

To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good evening. My name is Jeff Lagda, and I am a public affairs specialist at the EPA's Office of Inspector General. EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs forwarded the complaint of your constituent (b) (6), to the OIG.

I am confirming receipt of the complaint.

The leadership will review the matter, and the OIG will contact your office when appropriate.

Thanks,

Jeff

Jeffrey A. Lagda
Congressional and Media Liaison
Office of Congressional and Public Affairs - Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental and Protection Agency
1301 Constitution Ave. NW, Rm 3102
Washington, DC 20460
202-566-2584
Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2018 4:54 PM

To: OCIRmail <OCIRmail@epa.gov>

Subject: Congressional Inquiry (b) (6)

Dear EPA Congressional,

(b) (6), a constituent of Congressman Rob Woodall, contacted our office concerning the pending investigation with the Office of Inspector General. Please see the attached documents, including a privacy waiver and detailed description of the issue.

I appreciate you looking into this matter and any assistance you can provide.

Sincerely,

Paul Oh
Field Representative
Congressman Rob Woodall GA-7
Phone: 770-232-1131
Fax: 770-232-2909

June 19, 2019

(b) (6)

A small rectangular area of the document is redacted with a black box.

Rob Woodall
Member of United States Congress
House of Representatives
1724 Longworth House Office Building
Washington, District of Columbia 20515

REF: Environmental Protection Agency Office of Inspector General Investigation

Dear Congressman Woodall,

(b) (6)

A large rectangular area of the document is redacted with a black box.

(b) (6)



I appreciate your assistance. Please let me know if you need anything from me or have any questions.

Thank you.

(b) (6)



Ware, Rochelle

From: Elbaum, Kentia
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 2:03 PM
To: Larsen, Alan
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer; Lagda, Jeffrey
Subject: FW: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Al,

Please see below from Joe. What is your availability for a call and who would you like to attend?

Tia

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [mailto:Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the "same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General" to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator's office.

We'd appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator's security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG's position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has "impairment and impartiality requirements" that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We'd like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG's assessments of the Administrator's travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Ware, Rochelle

From: Elbaum, Kentia
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 2:03 PM
To: Larsen, Alan
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer; Lagda, Jeffrey
Subject: FW: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Al,

Please see below from Joe. What is your availability for a call and who would you like to attend?

Tia

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [mailto:Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the "same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General" to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator's office.

We'd appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator's security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG's position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has "impairment and impartiality requirements" that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We'd like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG's assessments of the Administrator's travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Ware, Rochelle

From: Kaplan, Jennifer
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 7:43 AM
To: (b) (6)
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Great. Can we get together in person for a few minutes? My schedule is open between 10:30 a.m. and 2 p.m. What time works best for you?

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 7:42 AM
To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

yes

From: Kaplan, Jennifer
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 7:21 AM
To: (b) (6); Collins, Kevin W. <Collins.Kevin@epa.gov>; (b) (6)
(b) (6) Hanger, Eric <Hanger.Eric@epa.gov>
Cc: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; (b) (6)
(b) (6)
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Thank you for this update, (b) (6) Are you in the office today?

Jennifer

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Friday, July 19, 2019 1:40 PM
To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Collins, Kevin W. <Collins.Kevin@epa.gov>; (b) (6)
(b) (6) Hanger, Eric <Hanger.Eric@epa.gov>
Cc: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; (b) (6)
(b) (6)
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

(b) (6)

Our investigation continues.

Thank you.

From: Kaplan, Jennifer
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2019 8:29 AM
To: Collins, Kevin W. <Collins.Kevin@epa.gov>; (b) (6)
(b) (6) Hanger, Eric <Hanger.Eric@epa.gov>

Cc: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Subject: FW: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning, Kevin, (b) (6) and Eric,

A staffer for Congressman Woodall (Georgia) periodically contacts OCPA on behalf of a constituent, (b) (6) requesting updates on an alleged OIG investigation of (b) (6). The first communication we received on this matter was in November 2018; while I think that all of you have it, I don't want to forward it again because the main document contains (b) (6) social security number, and I don't see a tool to redact it. In the attached communication received late yesterday, (b) (6) is alleging that Special Agent (b) (6) is using inappropriate tactics. Some of these also were mentioned in (b) (6) original letter to (b) (6) congressman last November. The staffer, Paul Oh, is asking the OIG to review these concerns. Please advise.

Thank you.

Jennifer

202 (b) (6) mobile

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 5:28 PM

To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>

Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry (b) (6)

Hi Jennifer,

Thank you for the email. (b) (6) had written a letter (attached) that explains (b) (6) concerns.

Thank you again for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Paul

From: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 2:35 PM

To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hello, Paul,

I'm happy to fill in while Jeff is on leave. If you are able to tell me the specific nature of (b) (6) concerns, I'll do my best to look into them.

Thank you.

Jennifer

Jennifer Kaplan
Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Congressional and Public Affairs
Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

202 (b) (6) mobile

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 10:11 AM
To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry (b) (6)

Good morning Jennifer and Kentai,

(b) (6)

I wanted to follow-up on the inquiry for (b) (6).

(b) (6) had expressed some concerns about the investigation tactics being used for (b) (6) case by the OIG. Is there a way to have someone who heads OIG to review (b) (6) concerns?

Thank you,

Paul Oh
Field Representative
Congressman Rob Woodall GA-7
Phone: 770-232-1131
Fax: 770-232-2909

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 9:00 AM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good morning. Still no updates that I can provide at this time!

Will reach out to you when I can.

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2019 2:19 PM
To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

I would like to check and see if there are any new updates on the inquiry for (b) (6).

Thank you,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 8:31 AM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning, Paul.

There are no updates at the moment. As promised, I will provide you information when I can.

Take care,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Friday, April 19, 2019 10:36 AM
To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning Jeff,

Following up again to see if there are any updates on the inquiry for (b) (6).

Thank you,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 3:00 PM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good afternoon. I unfortunately cannot provide any updates at this juncture. I will provide information once I am able to do so.

Always,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 2:50 PM
To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert

<Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

Could you please provide me with any new updates on the inquiry for (b) (6) ?

Sincerely,

Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Sent: Monday, January 28, 2019 8:08 AM

To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

I apologize for the delayed response, but we are just returning today after the lengthy shutdown.

At this point, all I can say is that this matter is under review. We will contact your office when appropriate.

Take care,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Sent: Thursday, January 3, 2019 3:25 PM

To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

Could you please provide me with an update on this case?

Sincerely,

Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2018 6:07 PM

To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good evening. My name is Jeff Lagda, and I am a public affairs specialist at the EPA's Office of Inspector General. EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs forwarded the complaint of your constituent (b) (6) to the OIG.

I am confirming receipt of the complaint.

The leadership will review the matter, and the OIG will contact your office when appropriate.

Thanks,

Jeff

Jeffrey A. Lagda
Congressional and Media Liaison
Office of Congressional and Public Affairs - Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental and Protection Agency
1301 Constitution Ave. NW, Rm 3102
Washington, DC 20460
202-566-2584
Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2018 4:54 PM
To: OCIRmail <OCIRmail@epa.gov>
Subject: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Dear EPA Congressional,

(b) (6) a constituent of Congressman Rob Woodall, contacted our office concerning the pending investigation with the Office of Inspector General. Please see the attached documents, including a privacy waiver and detailed description of the issue.

I appreciate you looking into this matter and any assistance you can provide.

Sincerely,

Paul Oh
Field Representative
Congressman Rob Woodall GA-7
Phone: 770-232-1131
Fax: 770-232-2909

Ware, Rochelle

From: (b) (6)
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 1:28 PM
To: Kaplan, Jennifer; (b) (6); Hanger, Eric
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

I am fine with this. Thank you.

From: Kaplan, Jennifer
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2019 12:02 PM
To: (b) (6) Hanger, Eric
<Hanger.Eric@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Thank you all for speaking with me (separate conversations) this morning. If acceptable to both OI and OC, I am proposing the following response. Please let me know if any edits should be made or if you have concerns. (b) (5)

(b) (6)

(b) (6)

(b) (6), (b) (5)

Jennifer Kaplan

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 5:28 PM
To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Jennifer,

Thank you for the email. (b) (6) had written a letter (attached) that explains (b) (6) concerns.

Thank you again for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Paul

From: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 2:35 PM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hello, Paul,

I'm happy to fill in while Jeff is on leave. If you are able to tell me the specific nature of (b) (6) concerns, I'll do my best to look into them.

Thank you.

Jennifer

Jennifer Kaplan
Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Congressional and Public Affairs
Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202 (b) (6) mobile

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 10:11 AM
To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning Jennifer and Kentai,

(b) (6)
I wanted to follow-up on the inquiry for (b) (6)
(b) (6) had expressed some concerns about the investigation tactics being used for (b) (6) case by the OIG. Is there a way to have someone who heads OIG to review (b) (6) concerns?

Thank you,

Paul Oh
Field Representative
Congressman Rob Woodall GA-7
Phone: 770-232-1131
Fax: 770-232-2909

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 9:00 AM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good morning. Still no updates that I can provide at this time!

Will reach out to you when I can.

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2019 2:19 PM
To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

I would like to check and see if there are any new updates on the inquiry for (b) (6).

Thank you,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 8:31 AM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning, Paul.

There are no updates at the moment. As promised, I will provide you information when I can.

Take care,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Friday, April 19, 2019 10:36 AM
To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning Jeff,

Following up again to see if there are any updates on the inquiry for (b) (6).

Thank you,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 3:00 PM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good afternoon. I unfortunately cannot provide any updates at this juncture. I will provide information once I am able to do so.

Always,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 2:50 PM

To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

Could you please provide me with any new updates on the inquiry for (b) (6)?

Sincerely,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Sent: Monday, January 28, 2019 8:08 AM

To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

I apologize for the delayed response, but we are just returning today after the lengthy shutdown.

At this point, all I can say is that this matter is under review. We will contact your office when appropriate.

Take care,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Sent: Thursday, January 3, 2019 3:25 PM

To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

Could you please provide me with an update on this case?

Sincerely,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2018 6:07 PM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good evening. My name is Jeff Lagda, and I am a public affairs specialist at the EPA's Office of Inspector General. EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs forwarded the complaint of your constituent (b) (6) to the OIG.

I am confirming receipt of the complaint.

The leadership will review the matter, and the OIG will contact your office when appropriate.

Thanks,

Jeff

Jeffrey A. Lagda
Congressional and Media Liaison
Office of Congressional and Public Affairs - Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental and Protection Agency
1301 Constitution Ave. NW, Rm 3102
Washington, DC 20460
202-566-2584
Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2018 4:54 PM
To: OCIRmail <OCIRmail@epa.gov>
Subject: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Dear EPA Congressional,

(b) (6) a constituent of Congressman Rob Woodall, contacted our office concerning the pending investigation with the Office of Inspector General. Please see the attached documents, including a privacy waiver and detailed description of the issue.

I appreciate you looking into this matter and any assistance you can provide.

Sincerely,

Paul Oh
Field Representative
Congressman Rob Woodall GA-7
Phone: 770-232-1131
Fax: 770-232-2909

Message

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]
Sent: 4/19/2018 7:38:17 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia [elbaum.kentia@epa.gov]; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) [Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov]; Lagda, Jeffrey [Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov]
CC: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) [Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good here and a call in would be helpful.

From: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 3:36 PM
To: Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>; Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Does noon on Monday, April 23rd work? Please let me know. Also, is there a number that we should call or do you need a call in number?

Thanks,

Tia

From: Choksi, Rachit (EPW) [mailto:Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 3:33 PM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Monday works. Free all day except 10:30-11:30am.

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 3:30 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Monday better on this end. Thanks.

From: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 3:21 PM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Are you available to talk at **3:30 p.m. today**? If not, we can schedule a call for Monday. Please let me know.

Thanks,

Tia

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [mailto:Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]

Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM

To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the “same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General” to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator’s office.

We’d appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator’s security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG’s position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has “impairment and impartiality requirements” that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We’d like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG’s assessments of the Administrator’s travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: 4/19/2018 7:33:43 PM
To: Choksi, Rachit (EPW) [Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov]; Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Elbaum, Kentia [elbaum.kentia@epa.gov]; Lagda, Jeffrey [Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov]
CC: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) [Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

same

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Choksi, Rachit (EPW)
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 3:33 PM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Monday works. Free all day except 10:30-11:30am.

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 3:30 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Monday better on this end. Thanks.

From: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 3:21 PM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Are you available to talk at **3:30 p.m. today**? If not, we can schedule a call for Monday. Please let me know.

Thanks,

Tia

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [mailto:Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW)

<Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the “same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General” to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator’s office.

We’d appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator’s security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG’s position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has “impairment and impartiality requirements” that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We’d like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG’s assessments of the Administrator’s travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)

Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM

To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Choksi, Rachit (EPW) [Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: 4/19/2018 7:33:08 PM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Elbaum, Kentia [elbaum.kentia@epa.gov]; Lagda, Jeffrey [Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov]
CC: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) [Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Monday works. Free all day except 10:30-11:30am.

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 3:30 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Monday better on this end. Thanks.

From: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 3:21 PM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Are you available to talk at **3:30 p.m. today**? If not, we can schedule a call for Monday. Please let me know.

Thanks,

Tia

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [mailto:Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the "same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General" to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator's office.

We'd appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator's security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG's position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has "impairment and impartiality requirements" that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We'd like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG's assessments of the Administrator's travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class

security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight

Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)

202-224-9214

Message

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]
Sent: 4/19/2018 7:29:58 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia [elbaum.kentia@epa.gov]; Lagda, Jeffrey [Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov]
CC: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) [Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) [Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Monday better on this end. Thanks.

From: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 3:21 PM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Are you available to talk at **3:30 p.m. today**? If not, we can schedule a call for Monday. Please let me know.

Thanks,

Tia

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [mailto:Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the "same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General" to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator's office.

We'd appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator's security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG's position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has "impairment and impartiality requirements" that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We'd like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG's assessments of the Administrator's travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)

Message

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]
Sent: 4/19/2018 5:55:53 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia [elbaum.kentia@epa.gov]; Lagda, Jeffrey [Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov]
CC: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) [Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) [Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the "same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General" to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator's office.

We'd appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator's security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG's position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has "impairment and impartiality requirements" that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We'd like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG's assessments of the Administrator's travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Larsen, Alan [Larsen.Alan@epa.gov]
Sent: 4/26/2018 3:19:31 PM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (Markey) [Michal_Freedhoff@markey.senate.gov]
Subject: FW: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest
Attachments: f.pdf

Michal—thanks for your follow-up. I asked Tia to respond to your note that you sent to her, but I also wanted to get back to you directly. I'm trying to figure a time I could either come up to see you (and any colleagues) in person tomorrow, or perhaps do a phone call as an alternative. I'll get back to you soon about what can work for me. In the meantime, would you be available mid- to late morning tomorrow (Friday)?

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 10:06 AM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good morning

I wanted to be sure you had a copy of this document, which is EPA's "push-back" document on all things Pruitt for today's hearing. It was authored by James Hewitt, who is an EPA press secretary. You'll see that it consistently references Patrick Sullivan and the IG when describing the security threat the Administrator faces. Do you plan to issue a statement describing your position on this, in light of our conversation earlier this week?

Thanks
michal

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.

- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the “same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General” to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator’s office.

We’d appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator’s security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG’s position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has “impairment and impartiality requirements” that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We’d like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG’s assessments of the Administrator’s travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt’s travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator’s security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]
Sent: 4/26/2018 3:14:34 PM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]; Elbaum, Kentia [elbaum.kentia@epa.gov]; Lagda, Jeffrey [Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov]
CC: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) [Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) [Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

And in a timely manner, as the Administrator has already referred to the OIG's assessments once today.

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW)
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 11:13 AM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

I appreciate that, and would be happy to do that, but it seems to me that one thing you could do is provide some clarity more publicly.

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 11:09 AM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Hi Michal,

I've passed this on to Al Larsen, Counsel to the IG and Assistant IG for Congressional and Public Affairs. He'd like to talk with you further about this in the next few days. He's reviewing this now.

Tia

Kentia Elbaum
Public Affairs Specialist
Office of Congressional and Public Affairs - Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental and Protection Agency
1301 Constitution Ave. NW, Rm 3102
Washington, DC 20460
202-566-2548
Elbaum.Kentia@epa.gov

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 10:06 AM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good morning

I wanted to be sure you had a copy of this document, which is EPA's "push-back" document on all things Pruitt for today's hearing. It was authored by James Hewitt, who is an EPA press secretary. You'll see that it consistently references Patrick Sullivan and the IG when describing the security threat the Administrator faces. Do you plan to issue a statement describing your position on this, in light of our conversation earlier this week?

Thanks
michal

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the "same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General" to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator's office.

We'd appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator's security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG's position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits

and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has "impairment and impartiality requirements" that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We'd like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG's assessments of the Administrator's travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)

Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM

To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]
Sent: 4/5/2018 8:32:00 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia [elbaum.kentia@epa.gov]
CC: Lagda, Jeffrey [Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov]; Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) [Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) [Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest
Attachments: 2018-4-5 TC-SW letter to Elkins.pdf

Tia,

Thank you for arranging this afternoon's call. On a separate matter, attached please find a letter to IG Elkins. Thank you.

Joe

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 11:46 AM
To: 'Elbaum, Kentia' <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Sure, that works. Can you circulate a call in number?

From: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 11:33 AM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: Re: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Are you available at 2 pm today?

Tia

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 5, 2018, at 10:56 AM, Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov> wrote:

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization

for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

<Carper 3-21-18 (Air Travel).pdf>

Message

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: 4/26/2018 3:13:09 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia [elbaum.kentia@epa.gov]; Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Lagda, Jeffrey [Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov]
CC: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) [Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) [Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

I appreciate that, and would be happy to do that, but it seems to me that one thing you could do is provide some clarity more publicly.

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 11:09 AM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Hi Michal,

I've passed this on to Al Larsen, Counsel to the IG and Assistant IG for Congressional and Public Affairs. He'd like to talk with you further about this in the next few days. He's reviewing this now.

Tia

Kentia Elbaum
Public Affairs Specialist
Office of Congressional and Public Affairs - Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental and Protection Agency
1301 Constitution Ave. NW, Rm 3102
Washington, DC 20460
202-566-2548
Elbaum.Kentia@epa.gov

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 10:06 AM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good morning

I wanted to be sure you had a copy of this document, which is EPA's "push-back" document on all things Pruitt for today's hearing. It was authored by James Hewitt, who is an EPA press secretary. You'll see that it consistently references Patrick Sullivan and the IG when describing the security threat the Administrator faces. Do you plan to issue a statement describing your position on this, in light of our conversation earlier this week?

Thanks
michal

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <LagdaJeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the "same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General" to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator's office.

We'd appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator's security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG's position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has "impairment and impartiality requirements" that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We'd like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG's assessments of the Administrator's travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available

evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov> <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: 4/26/2018 2:05:50 PM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Elbaum, Kentia [elbaum.kentia@epa.gov]; Lagda, Jeffrey [Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov]
CC: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) [Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) [Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest
Attachments: f.pdf

Good morning

I wanted to be sure you had a copy of this document, which is EPA's "push-back" document on all things Pruitt for today's hearing. It was authored by James Hewitt, who is an EPA press secretary. You'll see that it consistently references Patrick Sullivan and the IG when describing the security threat the Administrator faces. Do you plan to issue a statement describing your position on this, in light of our conversation earlier this week?

Thanks
michal

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the "same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General" to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator's office.

We'd appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator's security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG's position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has "impairment and impartiality requirements" that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We'd like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG's assessments of the Administrator's travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)

Message

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]
Sent: 4/5/2018 3:45:55 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia [elbaum.kentia@epa.gov]
CC: Lagda, Jeffrey [Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov]; Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) [Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) [Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Sure, that works. Can you circulate a call in number?

From: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 11:33 AM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: Re: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Are you available at 2 pm today?

Tia

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 5, 2018, at 10:56 AM, Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov> wrote:

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

<Carper 3-21-18 (Air Travel).pdf>

Message

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]
Sent: 4/5/2018 2:56:31 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia [elbaum.kentia@epa.gov]; Lagda, Jeffrey [Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov]
CC: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) [Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest
Attachments: Carper 3-21-18 (Air Travel).pdf

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Kaplan, Jennifer [Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov]
Sent: 7/22/2019 8:18:54 PM
To: Oh, Paul [Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov]
CC: Lagda, Jeffrey [Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov]; Elbaum, Kentia [elbaum.kentia@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good afternoon, Paul,

Thank you again for sharing (b) (6) letter, which alleges misconduct by OIG investigators. I have followed up with our Office of Investigations and been assured that no misconduct has occurred.

Please let Tia, Jeff and me know if you have additional questions we may be able to answer.

Jennifer

Jennifer Kaplan
Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Congressional and Public Affairs
Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-566-0918

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Thursday, July 11, 2019 5:36 PM
To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Thank you!

From: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, July 11, 2019 5:29 PM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Thank you, Paul. I did act on this email yesterday morning and am waiting for a reply from within my organization. I'll be back to you as soon as I am able.

Jennifer

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 5:28 PM
To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Jennifer,

Thank you for the email. (b) (6) had written a letter (attached) that explains (b) (6) concerns.

Thank you again for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,
Paul

From: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 2:35 PM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hello, Paul,

I'm happy to fill in while Jeff is on leave. If you are able to tell me the specific nature of (b) (6) concerns, I'll do my best to look into them.

Thank you.

Jennifer

Jennifer Kaplan
Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Congressional and Public Affairs
Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202 (b) (6) mobile

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, July 09, 2019 10:11 AM
To: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning Jennifer and Kentai,

(b) (6)

I wanted to follow-up on the inquiry for (b) (6).

(b) (6) had expressed some concerns about the investigation tactics being used for (b) (6) case by the OIG. Is there a way to have someone who heads OIG to review (b) (6) concerns?

Thank you,

Paul Oh
Field Representative
Congressman Rob Woodall GA-7
Phone: 770-232-1131
Fax: 770-232-2909

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2019 9:00 AM

To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good morning. Still no updates that I can provide a this time!

Will reach out to you when I can.

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Sent: Monday, June 10, 2019 2:19 PM

To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

I would like to check and see if there are any new updates on the inquiry for (b) (6).

Thank you,

Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Sent: Monday, April 22, 2019 8:31 AM

To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning, Paul.

There are no updates at the moment. As promised, I will provide you information when I can.

Take care,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Sent: Friday, April 19, 2019 10:36 AM

To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good morning Jeff,

Following up again to see if there are any updates on the inquiry for (b) (6).

Thank you,

Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 3:00 PM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good afternoon. I unfortunately cannot provide any updates at this juncture. I will provide information once I am able to do so.

Always,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2019 2:50 PM
To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

Could you please provide me with any new updates on the inquiry for (b) (6) ?

Sincerely,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Sent: Monday, January 28, 2019 8:08 AM
To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

I apologize for the delayed response, but we are just returning today after the lengthy shutdown.

At this point, all I can say is that this matter is under review. We will contact your office when appropriate.

Take care,

Jeff

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>
Sent: Thursday, January 3, 2019 3:25 PM
To: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert

<Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Good afternoon Jeff,

Could you please provide me with an update on this case?

Sincerely,
Paul

From: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, November 27, 2018 6:07 PM

To: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Kaplan, Jennifer <Kaplan.Jennifer@epa.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Mears, Gilbert <Mears.Gilbert@epa.gov>

Subject: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Hi Paul:

Good evening. My name is Jeff Lagda, and I am a public affairs specialist at the EPA's Office of Inspector General. EPA's Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs forwarded the complaint of your constituent, (b) (6), to the OIG.

I am confirming receipt of the complaint.

The leadership will review the matter, and the OIG will contact your office when appropriate.

Thanks,

Jeff

Jeffrey A. Lagda
Congressional and Media Liaison
Office of Congressional and Public Affairs - Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental and Protection Agency
1301 Constitution Ave. NW, Rm 3102
Washington, DC 20460
202-566-2584
Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Oh, Paul <Paul.Oh@mail.house.gov>

Sent: Thursday, November 15, 2018 4:54 PM

To: OCIRmail <OCIRmail@epa.gov>

Subject: Congressional Inquiry - (b) (6)

Dear EPA Congressional,

(b) (6) a constituent of Congressman Rob Woodall, contacted our office concerning the pending investigation with the Office of Inspector General. Please see the attached documents, including a privacy waiver and detailed description of the issue.

I appreciate you looking into this matter and any assistance you can provide.

Sincerely,

Paul Oh
Field Representative
Congressman Rob Woodall GA-7
Phone: 770-232-1131
Fax: 770-232-2909

Message

From: Elbaum, Kentia [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=ELBAUM, KENTIA]
Sent: 4/19/2018 7:35:55 PM
To: Choksi, Rachit (EPW) [Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov]; Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Lagda, Jeffrey [Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov]
CC: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) [Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Does noon on Monday, April 23rd work? Please let me know. Also, is there a number that we should call or do you need a call in number?

Thanks,

Tia

From: Choksi, Rachit (EPW) [mailto:Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 3:33 PM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Monday works. Free all day except 10:30-11:30am.

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 3:30 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Monday better on this end. Thanks.

From: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 3:21 PM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Are you available to talk at **3:30 p.m. today**? If not, we can schedule a call for Monday. Please let me know.

Thanks,

Tia

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [mailto:Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM

To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the “same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General” to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator’s office.

We’d appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator’s security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG’s position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has “impairment and impartiality requirements” that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We’d like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG’s assessments of the Administrator’s travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov> <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Elbaum, Kentia [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=ELBAUM, KENTIA]
Sent: 4/19/2018 7:21:02 PM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Lagda, Jeffrey [Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov]
CC: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) [Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) [Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Are you available to talk at **3:30 p.m. today**? If not, we can schedule a call for Monday. Please let me know.

Thanks,

Tia

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [mailto:Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the "same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General" to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator's office.

We'd appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator's security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG's position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has "impairment and impartiality requirements" that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We'd like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG's assessments of the Administrator's travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)

Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM

To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) (Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Elbaum, Kentia [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=ELBAUM, KENTIA]
Sent: 4/19/2018 6:02:13 PM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Lagda, Jeffrey [Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov]
CC: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) [Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) [Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Hi Joe,

We're reviewing this now. I'll get back with you with a proposed date/time for a call.

Tia

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [mailto:Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the "same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General" to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator's office.

We'd appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator's security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG's position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has "impairment and impartiality requirements" that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We'd like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG's assessments of the Administrator's travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)

Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM

To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Elbaum, Kentia [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=ELBAUM, KENTIA]
Sent: 4/5/2018 8:59:52 PM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]
CC: Lagda, Jeffrey [Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov]; Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) [Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) [Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: Re: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Thank you, Joe. I confirm receipt of the letter. I will forward this to IG Elkins.

Tia

Kentia Elbaum

Public Affairs Specialist

Office of Congressional and Public Affairs - Office of Inspector General

U.S. Environmental and Protection Agency

1301 Constitution Ave. NW, Rm 3102

Washington, DC 20460

202-566-2548

Elbaum.Kentia@epa.gov

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 5, 2018, at 4:32 PM, Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov> wrote:

Tia,

Thank you for arranging this afternoon's call. On a separate matter, attached please find a letter to IG Elkins. Thank you.

Joe

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 11:46 AM
To: 'Elbaum, Kentia' <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>;

Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Sure, that works. Can you circulate a call in number?

From: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>

Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 11:33 AM

To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>

Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse)

<Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: Re: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Are you available at 2 pm today?

Tia

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 5, 2018, at 10:56 AM, Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov> wrote:

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight

Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)

202-224-9214

<Carper 3-21-18 (Air Travel).pdf>

<2018-4-5 TC-SW letter to Elkins.pdf>

Message

From: Elbaum, Kentia [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=ELBAUM, KENTIA]
Sent: 4/26/2018 3:08:42 PM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]; Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Lagda, Jeffrey [Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov]
CC: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) [Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) [Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Hi Michal,

I've passed this on to Al Larsen, Counsel to the IG and Assistant IG for Congressional and Public Affairs. He'd like to talk with you further about this in the next few days. He's reviewing this now.

Tia

Kentia Elbaum
Public Affairs Specialist
Office of Congressional and Public Affairs - Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental and Protection Agency
1301 Constitution Ave. NW, Rm 3102
Washington, DC 20460
202-566-2548
Elbaum.Kentia@epa.gov

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 10:06 AM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good morning

I wanted to be sure you had a copy of this document, which is EPA's "push-back" document on all things Pruitt for today's hearing. It was authored by James Hewitt, who is an EPA press secretary. You'll see that it consistently references Patrick Sullivan and the IG when describing the security threat the Administrator faces. Do you plan to issue a statement describing your position on this, in light of our conversation earlier this week?

Thanks
michal

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the “same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General” to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator’s office.

We’d appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator’s security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG’s position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has “impairment and impartiality requirements” that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We’d like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG’s assessments of the Administrator’s travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)

Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM

To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Elbaum, Kentia [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=ELBAUM, KENTIA]
Sent: 4/5/2018 4:31:35 PM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]
CC: Lagda, Jeffrey [Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov]; Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) [Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) [Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Please call (b) (6). The conference extension is (b) (6) Participant code (b) (6)

Tia

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [mailto:Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 11:46 AM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Sure, that works. Can you circulate a call in number?

From: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 11:33 AM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>
Cc: Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>; Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: Re: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Are you available at 2 pm today?

Tia

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 5, 2018, at 10:56 AM, Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov> wrote:

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps

have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight

Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)

202-224-9214

<Carper 3-21-18 (Air Travel).pdf>

Message

From: Elbaum, Kentia [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=ELBAUM, KENTIA]
Sent: 4/5/2018 3:33:14 PM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]
CC: Lagda, Jeffrey [Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov]; Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) [Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: Re: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Are you available at 2 pm today?

Tia

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 5, 2018, at 10:56 AM, Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov> wrote:

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

<Carper 3-21-18 (Air Travel).pdf>

Message

From: Elbaum, Kentia [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=ELBAUM, KENTIA]
Sent: 4/5/2018 3:08:18 PM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Lagda, Jeffrey [Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov]
CC: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) [Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Hi Joe,

We can schedule a call. I will get back with you with a time and conference line number.

Tia

Kentia Elbaum
Public Affairs Specialist
Office of Congressional and Public Affairs - Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental and Protection Agency
1301 Constitution Ave. NW, Rm 3102
Washington, DC 20460
202-566-2548
Elbaum.Kentia@epa.gov

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [mailto:Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Elbaum, Kentia [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=ELBAUM, KENTIA]
Sent: 4/19/2018 7:43:39 PM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) [Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov]; Lagda, Jeffrey [Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov]
CC: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) [Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov]; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Please call (b) (6). The conference extension is (b) (6) Participant code: (b) (6)

Thanks,

Tia

Kentia Elbaum
Public Affairs Specialist
Office of Congressional and Public Affairs - Office of Inspector General
U.S. Environmental and Protection Agency
1301 Constitution Ave. NW, Rm 3102
Washington, DC 20460
202-566-2548
Elbaum.Kentia@epa.gov

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [mailto:Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 3:38 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good here and a call in would be helpful.

From: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 3:36 PM
To: Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>; Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Does noon on Monday, April 23rd work? Please let me know. Also, is there a number that we should call or do you need a call in number?

Thanks,

Tia

From: Choksi, Rachit (EPW) [mailto:Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 3:33 PM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Monday works. Free all day except 10:30-11:30am.

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 3:30 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Monday better on this end. Thanks.

From: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 3:21 PM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Are you available to talk at **3:30 p.m. today**? If not, we can schedule a call for Monday. Please let me know.

Thanks,

Tia

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) [mailto:Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the "same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General" to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator's office.

We'd appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator's security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG's position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has "impairment and impartiality requirements" that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We'd like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG's assessments of the Administrator's travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov> <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a

potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: 4/27/2018 2:50:17 PM
To: Larsen, Alan [Larsen.Alan@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

I have an 11 that I doubt will go a full half hour, but I don't know what the whitehouse staff have going on. email me when you arrive and I will do my best

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 10:49 AM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

I'm going to head out now, so I may arrive early. If you're available and want to start early, we can. Otherwise, I'll definitely be on hand for 11:30.

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 10:39 AM
To: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

We are fine to meet in person

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 10:15 AM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good morning. How's your day shaping up? Do you want to meet in person or have a phone call? Or has your day been totally hijacked, in which case I could find time at the beginning of the week.
Al Larsen

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:14 PM
To: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Ok – let's plan in person for now and re-evaluate if needed

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:12 PM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Ok—happy to do by phone if that means more of your folks can join in that way.

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:10 PM
To: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Ok – let's try to meet in (b) (6), and if we need to shift to a call (one of us may not be in tomorrow) I will let you know. Thanks.

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:07 PM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

I'll plan on coming up there tomorrow to talk to you and any of your colleagues who want to join in. If it's more convenient, we can just do it by phone.
AI

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 2:32 PM
To: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

11:30 tomorrow might work. He just cited the IG security threat issue in the second hearing

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 11:23 AM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: FW: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Michal—thanks for your follow-up. I asked Tia to respond to your note that you sent to her, but I also wanted to get back to you directly. I'm trying to figure a time I could either come up to see you (and any colleagues) in person tomorrow, or perhaps do a phone call as an alternative. I'll get back to you soon about what can work for me. In the meantime, would you be available mid- to late morning tomorrow (Friday)?

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 10:06 AM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good morning

I wanted to be sure you had a copy of this document, which is EPA's "push-back" document on all things Pruitt for today's hearing. It was authored by James Hewitt, who is an EPA press secretary. You'll see that it consistently references Patrick Sullivan and the IG when describing the security threat the Administrator faces. Do you plan to issue a statement describing your position on this, in light of our conversation earlier this week?

Thanks
michal

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the "same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General" to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator's office.

We'd appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator's security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG's position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has "impairment and impartiality requirements" that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We'd like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG's assessments of the Administrator's travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)

Message

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: 4/27/2018 2:39:06 PM
To: Larsen, Alan [Larsen.Alan@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

We are fine to meet in person

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 10:15 AM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good morning. How's your day shaping up? Do you want to meet in person or have a phone call? Or has your day been totally hijacked, in which case I could find time at the beginning of the week.
Al Larsen

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:14 PM
To: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Ok – let's plan in person for now and re-evaluate if needed

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:12 PM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Ok—happy to do by phone if that means more of your folks can join in that way.

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:10 PM
To: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Ok – let's try to meet in (b) (6), and if we need to shift to a call (one of us may not be in tomorrow) I will let you know.
Thanks.

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:07 PM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

I'll plan on coming up there tomorrow to talk to you and any of your colleagues who want to join in. If it's more convenient, we can just do it by phone.

AI

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 2:32 PM
To: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

11:30 tomorrow might work. He just cited the IG security threat issue in the second hearing

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 11:23 AM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: FW: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Michal—thanks for your follow-up. I asked Tia to respond to your note that you sent to her, but I also wanted to get back to you directly. I'm trying to figure a time I could either come up to see you (and any colleagues) in person tomorrow, or perhaps do a phone call as an alternative. I'll get back to you soon about what can work for me. In the meantime, would you be available mid- to late morning tomorrow (Friday))?

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 10:06 AM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good morning

I wanted to be sure you had a copy of this document, which is EPA's "push-back" document on all things Pruitt for today's hearing. It was authored by James Hewitt, who is an EPA press secretary. You'll see that it consistently references Patrick Sullivan and the IG when describing the security threat the Administrator faces. Do you plan to issue a statement describing your position on this, in light of our conversation earlier this week?

Thanks
michal

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)

Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM

To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <LagdaJeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the “same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General” to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator’s office.

We’d appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator’s security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG’s position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has “impairment and impartiality requirements” that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We’d like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG’s assessments of the Administrator’s travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: 4/26/2018 7:09:35 PM
To: Larsen, Alan [Larsen.Alan@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Ok – let's try to meet in (b) (6), and if we need to shift to a call (one of us may not be in tomorrow) I will let you know. Thanks.

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:07 PM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

I'll plan on coming up there tomorrow to talk to you and any of your colleagues who want to join in. If it's more convenient, we can just do it by phone.
Al

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 2:32 PM
To: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

11:30 tomorrow might work. He just cited the IG security threat issue in the second hearing

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 11:23 AM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: FW: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Michal—thanks for your follow-up. I asked Tia to respond to your note that you sent to her, but I also wanted to get back to you directly. I'm trying to figure a time I could either come up to see you (and any colleagues) in person tomorrow, or perhaps do a phone call as an alternative. I'll get back to you soon about what can work for me. In the meantime, would you be available mid- to late morning tomorrow (Friday))?

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 10:06 AM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW)

<Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good morning

I wanted to be sure you had a copy of this document, which is EPA's "push-back" document on all things Pruitt for today's hearing. It was authored by James Hewitt, who is an EPA press secretary. You'll see that it consistently references Patrick Sullivan and the IG when describing the security threat the Administrator faces. Do you plan to issue a statement describing your position on this, in light of our conversation earlier this week?

Thanks
michal

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the "same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General" to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator's office.

We'd appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator's security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG's position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has "impairment and impartiality requirements" that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We'd like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG's assessments of the Administrator's travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) (Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: 4/26/2018 6:32:24 PM
To: Larsen, Alan [Larsen.Alan@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

11:30 tomorrow might work. He just cited the IG security threat issue in the second hearing

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 11:23 AM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: FW: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Michal—thanks for your follow-up. I asked Tia to respond to your note that you sent to her, but I also wanted to get back to you directly. I'm trying to figure a time I could either come up to see you (and any colleagues) in person tomorrow, or perhaps do a phone call as an alternative. I'll get back to you soon about what can work for me. In the meantime, would you be available mid- to late morning tomorrow (Friday)?

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 10:06 AM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good morning

I wanted to be sure you had a copy of this document, which is EPA's "push-back" document on all things Pruitt for today's hearing. It was authored by James Hewitt, who is an EPA press secretary. You'll see that it consistently references Patrick Sullivan and the IG when describing the security threat the Administrator faces. Do you plan to issue a statement describing your position on this, in light of our conversation earlier this week?

Thanks
michal

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW)

<Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the “same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General” to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator’s office.

We’d appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator’s security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG’s position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has “impairment and impartiality requirements” that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We’d like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG’s assessments of the Administrator’s travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)

Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM

To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: 4/26/2018 4:46:05 PM
To: Larsen, Alan [Larsen.Alan@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Happy to find time but the Administrator just read aloud the IG endorsement of the security threats he faced, He has done that several times already today. will be back in touch w times after the hearing

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 11:23 AM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: FW: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Michal—thanks for your follow-up. I asked Tia to respond to your note that you sent to her, but I also wanted to get back to you directly. I'm trying to figure a time I could either come up to see you (and any colleagues) in person tomorrow, or perhaps do a phone call as an alternative. I'll get back to you soon about what can work for me. In the meantime, would you be available mid- to late morning tomorrow (Friday)?

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 10:06 AM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good morning

I wanted to be sure you had a copy of this document, which is EPA's "push-back" document on all things Pruitt for today's hearing. It was authored by James Hewitt, who is an EPA press secretary. You'll see that it consistently references Patrick Sullivan and the IG when describing the security threat the Administrator faces. Do you plan to issue a statement describing your position on this, in light of our conversation earlier this week?

Thanks
michal

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the “same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General” to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator’s office.

We’d appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator’s security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG’s position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has “impairment and impartiality requirements” that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We’d like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG’s assessments of the Administrator’s travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)

Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM

To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Larsen, Alan [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=F5C96E714C314C7AA36C27E3181C8FAE-LARSEN, ALAN]
Sent: 4/27/2018 2:48:59 PM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

I'm going to head out now, so I may arrive early. If you're available and want to start early, we can. Otherwise, I'll definitely be on hand for 11:30.

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 10:39 AM
To: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

We are fine to meet in person

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 10:15 AM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good morning. How's your day shaping up? Do you want to meet in person or have a phone call? Or has your day been totally hijacked, in which case I could find time at the beginning of the week.
Al Larsen

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:14 PM
To: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Ok -- let's plan in person for now and re-evaluate if needed

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:12 PM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Ok—happy to do by phone if that means more of your folks can join in that way.

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:10 PM

To: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Ok – let's try to meet in (b) (6), and if we need to shift to a call (one of us may not be in tomorrow) I will let you know. Thanks.

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.

Director of Oversight

Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>

Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:07 PM

To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

I'll plan on coming up there tomorrow to talk to you and any of your colleagues who want to join in. If it's more convenient, we can just do it by phone.

AI

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]

Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 2:32 PM

To: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

11:30 tomorrow might work. He just cited the IG security threat issue in the second hearing

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.

Director of Oversight

Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>

Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 11:23 AM

To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: FW: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Michal—thanks for your follow-up. I asked Tia to respond to your note that you sent to her, but I also wanted to get back to you directly. I'm trying to figure a time I could either come up to see you (and any colleagues) in person tomorrow, or perhaps do a phone call as an alternative. I'll get back to you soon about what can work for me. In the meantime, would you be available mid- to late morning tomorrow (Friday)?

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]

Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 10:06 AM

To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good morning

I wanted to be sure you had a copy of this document, which is EPA's "push-back" document on all things Pruitt for today's hearing. It was authored by James Hewitt, who is an EPA press secretary. You'll see that it consistently references Patrick Sullivan and the IG when describing the security threat the Administrator faces. Do you plan to issue a statement describing your position on this, in light of our conversation earlier this week?

Thanks
michal

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <LagdaJeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the "same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General" to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator's office.

We'd appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator's security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG's position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has "impairment and impartiality requirements" that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We'd like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG's assessments of the Administrator's travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available

evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov> <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Larsen, Alan [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=F5C96E714C314C7AA36C27E3181C8FAE-LARSEN, ALAN]
Sent: 4/27/2018 2:43:07 PM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Ok—I'll be at (b) (6) at 11:30.
Al Larsen

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 10:39 AM
To: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

We are fine to meet in person

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Friday, April 27, 2018 10:15 AM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good morning. How's your day shaping up? Do you want to meet in person or have a phone call? Or has your day been totally hijacked, in which case I could find time at the beginning of the week.
Al Larsen

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:14 PM
To: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Ok — let's plan in person for now and re-evaluate if needed

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:12 PM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Ok—happy to do by phone if that means more of your folks can join in that way.

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:10 PM

To: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Ok – let's try to meet in (b) (6), and if we need to shift to a call (one of us may not be in tomorrow) I will let you know. Thanks.

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.

Director of Oversight

Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>

Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:07 PM

To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

I'll plan on coming up there tomorrow to talk to you and any of your colleagues who want to join in. If it's more convenient, we can just do it by phone.

AI

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]

Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 2:32 PM

To: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>

Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

11:30 tomorrow might work. He just cited the IG security threat issue in the second hearing

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.

Director of Oversight

Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>

Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 11:23 AM

To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: FW: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Michal—thanks for your follow-up. I asked Tia to respond to your note that you sent to her, but I also wanted to get back to you directly. I'm trying to figure a time I could either come up to see you (and any colleagues) in person tomorrow, or perhaps do a phone call as an alternative. I'll get back to you soon about what can work for me. In the meantime, would you be available mid- to late morning tomorrow (Friday)?

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]

Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 10:06 AM

To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good morning

I wanted to be sure you had a copy of this document, which is EPA's "push-back" document on all things Pruitt for today's hearing. It was authored by James Hewitt, who is an EPA press secretary. You'll see that it consistently references Patrick Sullivan and the IG when describing the security threat the Administrator faces. Do you plan to issue a statement describing your position on this, in light of our conversation earlier this week?

Thanks
michal

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <LagdaJeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the "same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General" to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator's office.

We'd appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator's security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG's position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has "impairment and impartiality requirements" that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We'd like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG's assessments of the Administrator's travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available

evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov> <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Larsen, Alan [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=F5C96E714C314C7AA36C27E3181C8FAE-LARSEN, ALAN]
Sent: 4/27/2018 2:15:05 PM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good morning. How's your day shaping up? Do you want to meet in person or have a phone call? Or has your day been totally hijacked, in which case I could find time at the beginning of the week.

Al Larsen

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:14 PM
To: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Ok – let's plan in person for now and re-evaluate if needed

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:12 PM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Ok—happy to do by phone if that means more of your folks can join in that way.

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:10 PM
To: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Ok – let's try to meet in (b) (6), and if we need to shift to a call (one of us may not be in tomorrow) I will let you know. Thanks.

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:07 PM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

I'll plan on coming up there tomorrow to talk to you and any of your colleagues who want to join in. If it's more convenient, we can just do it by phone.

Al

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 2:32 PM
To: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

11:30 tomorrow might work. He just cited the IG security threat issue in the second hearing

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 11:23 AM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: FW: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Michal—thanks for your follow-up. I asked Tia to respond to your note that you sent to her, but I also wanted to get back to you directly. I'm trying to figure a time I could either come up to see you (and any colleagues) in person tomorrow, or perhaps do a phone call as an alternative. I'll get back to you soon about what can work for me. In the meantime, would you be available mid- to late morning tomorrow (Friday))?

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 10:06 AM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good morning

I wanted to be sure you had a copy of this document, which is EPA's "push-back" document on all things Pruitt for today's hearing. It was authored by James Hewitt, who is an EPA press secretary. You'll see that it consistently references Patrick Sullivan and the IG when describing the security threat the Administrator faces. Do you plan to issue a statement describing your position on this, in light of our conversation earlier this week?

Thanks
michal

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the “same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General” to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator’s office.

We’d appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator’s security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG’s position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has “impairment and impartiality requirements” that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We’d like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG’s assessments of the Administrator’s travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)

Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM

To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov> <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Larsen, Alan [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=F5C96E714C314C7AA36C27E3181C8FAE-LARSEN, ALAN]
Sent: 4/26/2018 7:12:27 PM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Ok—happy to do by phone if that means more of your folks can join in that way.

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:10 PM
To: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Ok – let's try to meet in (b) (6), and if we need to shift to a call (one of us may not be in tomorrow) I will let you know. Thanks.

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 3:07 PM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

I'll plan on coming up there tomorrow to talk to you and any of your colleagues who want to join in. If it's more convenient, we can just do it by phone.
AI

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 2:32 PM
To: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

11:30 tomorrow might work. He just cited the IG security threat issue in the second hearing

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 11:23 AM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: FW: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Michal—thanks for your follow-up. I asked Tia to respond to your note that you sent to her, but I also wanted to get back to you directly. I'm trying to figure a time I could either come up to see you (and any colleagues) in person

tomorrow, or perhaps do a phone call as an alternative. I'll get back to you soon about what can work for me. In the meantime, would you be available mid- to late morning tomorrow (Friday))?

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 10:06 AM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good morning

I wanted to be sure you had a copy of this document, which is EPA's "push-back" document on all things Pruitt for today's hearing. It was authored by James Hewitt, who is an EPA press secretary. You'll see that it consistently references Patrick Sullivan and the IG when describing the security threat the Administrator faces. Do you plan to issue a statement describing your position on this, in light of our conversation earlier this week?

Thanks
michal

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the "same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General" to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator's office.

We'd appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator's security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG's position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has "impairment and impartiality requirements" that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We'd like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG's assessments of the Administrator's travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight

Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Larsen, Alan [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=F5C96E714C314C7AA36C27E3181C8FAE-LARSEN, ALAN]
Sent: 4/26/2018 7:06:48 PM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

I'll plan on coming up there tomorrow to talk to you and any of your colleagues who want to join in. If it's more convenient, we can just do it by phone.

Al

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 2:32 PM
To: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

11:30 tomorrow might work. He just cited the IG security threat issue in the second hearing

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Larsen, Alan <Larsen.Alan@epa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 11:23 AM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: FW: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Michal—thanks for your follow-up. I asked Tia to respond to your note that you sent to her, but I also wanted to get back to you directly. I'm trying to figure a time I could either come up to see you (and any colleagues) in person tomorrow, or perhaps do a phone call as an alternative. I'll get back to you soon about what can work for me. In the meantime, would you be available mid- to late morning tomorrow (Friday))?

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 10:06 AM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good morning

I wanted to be sure you had a copy of this document, which is EPA's "push-back" document on all things Pruitt for today's hearing. It was authored by James Hewitt, who is an EPA press secretary. You'll see that it consistently references Patrick Sullivan and the IG when describing the security threat the Administrator faces. Do you plan to issue a statement describing your position on this, in light of our conversation earlier this week?

Thanks
michal

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the “same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General” to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator’s office.

We’d appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator’s security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG’s position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has “impairment and impartiality requirements” that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We’d like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG’s assessments of the Administrator’s travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt's travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Larsen, Alan [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=F5C96E714C314C7AA36C27E3181C8FAE-LARSEN, ALAN]
Sent: 4/26/2018 3:22:38 PM
To: michal_freedhoff@epw.senate.gov
Subject: FW: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest
Attachments: f.pdf

Michal—thanks for your follow-up. I asked Tia to respond to your note that you sent to her, but I also wanted to get back to you directly. I'm trying to figure a time I could either come up to see you (and any colleagues) in person tomorrow, or perhaps do a phone call as an alternative. I'll get back to you soon about what can work for me. In the meantime, would you be available mid- to late morning tomorrow (Friday)?

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 10:06 AM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good morning

I wanted to be sure you had a copy of this document, which is EPA's "push-back" document on all things Pruitt for today's hearing. It was authored by James Hewitt, who is an EPA press secretary. You'll see that it consistently references Patrick Sullivan and the IG when describing the security threat the Administrator faces. Do you plan to issue a statement describing your position on this, in light of our conversation earlier this week?

Thanks
michal

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the “same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General” to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator’s office.

We’d appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator’s security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG’s position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has “impairment and impartiality requirements” that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We’d like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG’s assessments of the Administrator’s travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
 Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
 202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)

Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM

To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt’s travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from

Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214

Message

From: Larsen, Alan [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=F5C96E714C314C7AA36C27E3181C8FAE-LARSEN, ALAN]
Sent: 4/26/2018 3:19:31 PM
To: Freedhoff, Michal (Markey) [Michal_Freedhoff@markey.senate.gov]
BCC: Elbaum, Kentia [elbaum.kentia@epa.gov]; Lagda, Jeffrey [Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov]
Subject: FW: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest
Attachments: f.pdf

Michal—thanks for your follow-up. I asked Tia to respond to your note that you sent to her, but I also wanted to get back to you directly. I'm trying to figure a time I could either come up to see you (and any colleagues) in person tomorrow, or perhaps do a phone call as an alternative. I'll get back to you soon about what can work for me. In the meantime, would you be available mid- to late morning tomorrow (Friday)?

From: Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) [mailto:Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 26, 2018 10:06 AM
To: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse) <Joe_Gaeta@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Good morning

I wanted to be sure you had a copy of this document, which is EPA's "push-back" document on all things Pruitt for today's hearing. It was authored by James Hewitt, who is an EPA press secretary. You'll see that it consistently references Patrick Sullivan and the IG when describing the security threat the Administrator faces. Do you plan to issue a statement describing your position on this, in light of our conversation earlier this week?

Thanks
michal

Michal Ilana Freedhoff, Ph.D.
Director of Oversight
Committee on Environment and Public Works Democratic Staff

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)
Sent: Thursday, April 19, 2018 1:56 PM
To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; Lagda, Jeffrey <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>
Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>; Choksi, Rachit (EPW) <Rachit_Choksi@epw.senate.gov>
Subject: RE: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with us a couple of weeks ago about concerns we have with ongoing OIG audits of EPA spending on travel and security. Since that time there have been additional developments related to the potential conflicts we raised. Those include:

- The CREW complaint to CIGIE, following the reporting by the New York Times that Mr. Perrotta and Mr. Sullivan have a personal relationship.
- The statement by EPA spokesman Jahan Wilcox, reported in The Hill, that EPA used the “same vendor that the Office of the Inspector General” to conduct a security sweep of the Administrator’s office.

We’d appreciate having another call to discuss these new issues and confirm our understanding of several points you made during our first call.

OIG explained that it does not direct or recommend what steps should be taken to protect EPA personnel, but it does investigate specific threats against EPA personnel and communicate that information with EPA officials. We would like to better understand the statutory or regulatory authority under which OIG performs these functions, which other EPA components OIG works with, and the nature of those relationships.

OIG also stated that it does not believe it has a conflict of interest in its audits of travel and security spending simply because EPA is using OIG data to make its programmatic assessments for the Administrator’s security. Is that a correct understanding of OIG’s position? Has OIG taken any steps to create firewalls between those conducting these audits and those at OIG who conduct investigations into alleged threats against the Administrator? Has the CREW complaint to CIGIE caused OIG to reconsider its position?

Senators Carper and Whitehouse and the media have identified possible self-dealing by Mr. Perrotta. In response to the New York Times article, OIG stated that it has “impairment and impartiality requirements” that are intended to prevent bias in any investigation. We’d like to discuss how OIG is applying those requirements to this situation.

Finally, OIG stated during the call that it would not come to programmatic conclusions as part of its travel and security investigations. We understand this to mean that OIG’s assessments of the Administrator’s travel and security spending will only seek to determine if the proper paperwork containing a permissible justification for this spending was completed and not whether the justification provided was objectively reasonable and supported by available evidence. In other words, these assessments will not consider whether or not the justifications provided were pretextual. Is this correct?

Once your team has had a chance to review these questions, please let us know a good time to set up a call to discuss. Thanks.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
 Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
 202-224-9214

From: Gaeta, Joe (Whitehouse)

Sent: Thursday, April 5, 2018 10:57 AM

To: Elbaum, Kentia <elbaum.kentia@epa.gov>; 'Lagda, Jeffrey' <Lagda.Jeffrey@epa.gov>

Cc: Dudis, Dan (Whitehouse) <Dan_Dudis@whitehouse.senate.gov>; Freedhoff, Michal (EPW) <Michal_Freedhoff@epw.senate.gov>

Subject: questions about potential OIG conflict of interest

Jeff and Tia,

As you know, Senator Whitehouse and other members of Congress have made several requests that EPA OIG review Administrator Pruitt’s travel and security expenditures. Your office has accepted and twice modified a project related to travel (OA-FY17-0382) about which Senator Whitehouse has written to the IG, your office has accepted a project from

Mr. DeFazio and Ms. Napolitano about security spending, and your office has acknowledged receipt of a request from Senator Whitehouse dated March 20 about the Administrator's security detail.

On March 21, Senator Carper received the attached letter from EPA's Office of Congressional Affairs related to the Administrator's past air travel. In that letter EPA cites as justification for its authorization for Mr. Pruitt to fly first-class security assessments done by OIG in conjunction with the Administrator's security detail. Does OIG consider this a potential conflict of interest? If not, why not? If so, what steps have been taken to firewall OIG investigations in which an evaluation of OIG's security assessments may be material in any determination of misconduct by EPA?

I'd appreciate having a call to discuss this further given the importance of these investigations. Thank you.

Joe Gaeta

Senior Advisor and Director of Oversight
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D-RI)
202-224-9214